

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

The Board convened in the Commissioners' Hearing Room, 6th Floor, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Commissioners Morris, Stanton, and Pridemore, Chair, present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Commissioners conducted the Flag Salute.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Pridemore stated that item 6 had been pulled for further review and that there was also a request to pull item 7.

Bill Barron, County Administrator, explained that there was a request from Bridget Schwarz to discuss item 7 – the Construction Assurance Agreement. He then explained that item 6 was pulled at the request of the Health Department because it hadn't gone through the proper process.

MOVED by Stanton to approve items 1 through 13, with the exception of item 6. Commissioners Pridemore, Morris, and Stanton voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 22)

Pridemore indicated that he too had questions regarding item 7. He said it appears that the architect was being cut out of the process and asked Bronson Potter why that was.

Bronson Potter, Prosecuting Attorney's Office, said the proposed amendment would remove the requirement that the architect certify that the project has been completed in conformance with the governing documents. He said that because there is a dispute between the developer, which is Quincunx, and the architect, Quincunx is unable to provide that certification. However, they have a number of levels of assurance that the project has been completed in conformance with the governing documents: Quincunx; Hoffman Construction, the prime contractor who constructed the facility and actually designed a number of the major components of it; Ed McMillan, who has been onsite and has attended all of the construction meetings; Doug Johnston, who has also inspected the facility and has attended the construction meetings; and the Department of Community Development. Potter said their primary concern when they put that provision in the original contract was that they wanted to be sure that they were receiving a quality facility, which at that time was described as a \$10 million facility. He said they have since

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

received certification that what they are getting is more along the order of a \$28 million facility, and there is no question about the quality.

Morris asked what the architect's issues were.

Potter replied that the architect has no issues with the facility itself. He explained that the architect and developer are having a dispute about who is responsible for some of the cost overruns, i.e. a financial dispute. *Potter* said what he is proposing is that they have five levels of assurance versus six, and that they relieve Quincunx of the one obligation to provide the one level of assurance.

Bridget Schwarz, 2110 NW 179th Street, Ridgefield, said that having the architect's signature on the certificate is important because the noise study emphasized how important the architectural design of the facility was to meeting the noise limitations and complying with the noise laws. Ms. Schwarz stated that at the approval process one of the conditions was that the amphitheater be orientated to the north/northeast so that its noise would impact the freeway interchange more than anything else. She said the amphitheater does not point north/northeast. She talked about the noise levels being measured at the property lines; there could be an effect on the properties that are affected by the noise contours that come out of the amphitheater. Finally, Schwarz stated that the condition of approval stated that changes had to be made to the proposed development – sufficient changes to insure that the noise levels would be at 59 LEQ at the property lines. Schwarz further discussed her concerns. She said if they have five levels of approval instead of six, then they need more information about how the noise is going to be monitored, what changes were made, etc.

Potter pointed out that the Department of Community Development had hired a sound engineer to review the facility. He said there was a condition of approval imposed by the Hearings Examiner that the south side of the facility have some additional design work to address sound levels. After reviewing the facility, the sound engineer concluded that the construction complied with the Hearings Examiner's requirement.

There was further discussion.

Stanton asked for clarification about whether Ed McMillan was a member of the review team on behalf of the county and not just there for storm water.

Potter said Mr. McMillan looked at the entire facility.

There being no public comment, **MOVED** by Stanton to approve item 7. Commissioners Pridemore, Morris, and Stanton voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 22)

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

PUBLIC HEARING: PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Held a public hearing to deliberate towards the selection of a Preferred 20-year Comprehensive Plan Alternative pursuant to the Washington State Growth Management Act.

There was brief discussion about how to proceed with the deliberations.

Stanton said one of the issues she wished to address was relative to the question of where to draw lines when drawing urban growth boundaries – right down a road or both sides?

Pridemore mentioned previous discussion regarding assumptions from the road percentage, allocation of rural lands, as well as the issue of siting schools.

Morris said she felt it seemed sensible to include both sides of a road. For example, the residents living on 179th who want to go onto sewer haven't been able to because all the sewers right down the middle of 179th Street are not in the UGB.

Stanton said they were now talking about cost-effective growth and that at some point she would like to consider it as one of the big issues they will discuss.

Morris asked if it was a big issue or not. She said the GMA wants a natural boundary and that they had thought that those roads become natural boundaries...

Pridemore said they had very big discussion a few years back when the 179th Street issue arose, and they had decided to leave it as it was. He said it seemed that they were all thinking that something other than the middle of the road would be appropriate.

Stanton said the question becomes "where do you draw the line?" She said there are some things they need to know when it comes time to make that determination to change.

Pridemore addressed the issue of assumption and said the first assumption is always the road percentage.

Stanton said she wasn't sure it was and that when she supported the 1.5% she did it knowing what the other assumptions were and that there was quite a bit of cushion in the other assumptions. It created a real growth number that was higher than the 1.5%. *Stanton* said they have better data then they did when the plan was adopted in 1994 and that it would be important for them to get to realistic numbers regarding jobs per acre, market factor, infrastructure, critical lands, people per household. She said they ought to use the census data.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Morris said she thought they needed to raise the population factor from 1.5 to 1.8, and that she wanted to keep the market factor. She said she believed they needed to increase the population per dwelling unit and the density per commercial and industrial, and suggested that the 2.66 is realistic for dwelling units. She said she felt they should change the industrial and commercial to 12 and 22. She stated that it would be appropriate to lower the infrastructure allocation some, but wouldn't be very excited about going down to 30%. *Morris* then stated that they have not seen the regulatory requirements for riparian habitat increase the way they expected they might under the ESA, but that they would see the stormwater issues addressed. She agreed that there needed to be an adjustment, but that she wasn't sure 38% was accurate. She would, however, lean heavily towards Commissioner Pridemore's understanding of it is. *Morris* referenced the redevelopment factor and asked Pat Lee if he had calculated 70% redevelopment on use of underutilized lands.

Patrick Lee, Department of Community Development, responded. He said that built into the models on capacity, 30% of the underutilized lands will never convert and 10% of vacant parcels will never convert in the 20-year planning horizon.

Morris said they either need to change that number or take a look at what they considered were underutilized lands. She further explained. She said she felt those were areas in which new agreements needed to be reached. She commented that she was worried about the urban/rural split. She said they are essentially built out now and that is a gigantic issue for them. *Morris* said she would like to separate jobs from growth and would like to reconnect jobs to total population. She said she still liked the Discovery Corridor approach and that if they are not serious about doing it now, they should create some sort of Discovery Corridor/industrial futures, and along with that they create conditions under which it can develop. Regarding the site specific requests, she said that it seemed that many of them were adjacent to either existing urban growth boundaries or proposed urban growth boundaries. She said if they make good sense she is willing to go along with those requests and to let those help them make some decisions on boundary movement.

Stanton said they do have the discussion about this big economic region...that some people will choose to move to Portland and work in Clark County. She said that was definitely a concern and she would like to see it better balanced. *Stanton* referenced the infrastructure percentage *Morris* had talked about. She said staff referenced schools in the Ridgefield example with the 10% of the land. She said she thought schools were taken out before they talked about the infrastructure set aside.

Lee said existing tax-exempt properties, which would include school-owned properties, were taken out of the buildable lands inventory from the start.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Stanton said in addition to improving the jobs and population balance, she had a concern about the cost of growth and whether or not the appropriate jurisdictions can provide for the infrastructure, as well as the ongoing operating expenses. *Stanton* talked about the difference to the school districts between the various alternatives - \$950 million worth of new schools down to \$450 million. She said they need to keep that in mind when they talk about population. She said they are attracting a lot of people from the Portland metropolitan area because they are coming here for better schools. Also, a lot of the housing that has been built since 1994 is affordable, family-style housing. She said that makes a big difference in terms of the impacts to various services. She said they need to be very cognizant of the infrastructure costs beyond what they typically worry about, e.g. roads, water/sewer; schools are very important. She said it is also important to move onto urban reserve areas first. She said she thought the current plan says that they will only grow into urban reserve areas, and they would need to make a policy change in their plan if they do otherwise – they need to keep that in mind. *Stanton* referenced tax base for jurisdictions and stated the importance of that. She said she also likes the Discovery Corridor idea for a long term approach, but before doing it immediately she would consider two things: 1) one school district; and 2) the impacts to I-5. She further explained. She said they would need to consider an arterial system for access controls in their capital facilities planning in the future. *Stanton* said that local preferences are important to her and that they need to consider what the cities have asked for. She said she also has a concern about the ongoing operating expense of the county taking on much more in the way of urban land that is residential – they need to minimize that. Lastly, she referenced the suitability of an area for development.

Pridemore asked for clarification regarding the critical lands assumption being 5% or 10% - was Commissioner *Stanton* referring to redevelopment factor?

Stanton said it was critical lands, but asked staff to respond.

Lee replied that the assumption they've used is that 5% of lands designated critical will be built upon. He said the plan monitoring report showed that the rate has actually been about 10%.

Stanton asked if that was the difference on 134th Street with some of their assumptions out there for traffic.

Lee said that was one of the issues that was brought out; that, in fact, because of some critical lands designations they did not allocate as much of the jobs as they had actually seen on some of those parcels – notably the Legacy parcel, which was thrown out of the inventory.

Morris referenced Alternative 2A and said that one of the attractions about it was the fact that it phased development and respected existing neighborhoods. She said that is something they need to pay a lot of attention to.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Pridemore asked (*Stanton*) what her thoughts were on the urban/rural.

Stanton said she wasn't sure she fully understood what the intention was regarding the 81/19 split. She said she felt it needed clarification.

Pridemore said when they adopted it before, it had been stated that historically the rural areas had taken 19% of the population growth. That's what they did in 1994. He further explained.

Stanton said it is important to take a long-term, build-out look at the area and do something to adjust it so they can actually achieve what it is they hope to achieve when the community is entirely built out.

Pridemore moved onto the issue of site specific requests.

Stanton said where they make sense they ought to incorporate them, but give the pretty clear comments back to staff at the end. She said that would be her first preference...

Pridemore asked *Stanton* if there was a preferred alternative that she favored.

Stanton said she is interested in having a discussion about perhaps trying to establish one industrial land bank area to get started. She said she recognized that both La Center and Ridgefield commented that they didn't want to see that happen, but to instead do a sub area plan between La Center and Ridgefield. She said she understood that for long-term, but that she has an interest in trying an industrial land bank.

Pridemore commented on his preferences. He said he did suggest the original 1.5% growth. He said the thing he has heard most about the population forecast that worries him is the impact...that this is a pretty significant change in what they're talking about for growth patterns in Clark County and when you start dealing with businesses, a radical shock is not a good thing, particularly in this kind of economy. A more gradual transition is appropriate as Eric Hovee had talked about. He said he has come to believe that a 1.95% is an appropriate population growth. That is now the mid-range of the state forecast; it's close to what the Home Builders Association had suggested in their testimony, which was 2%; and it's also close to what Mr. Hovee had suggested, which was 1.83%. That would be close to where they needed to be in order to avoid economic impacts. *Pridemore* said he couldn't see any justification for keeping the market factor. It may have made some sense as they began growth management; however, with a 20-year land supply that they adjust every 10 years and a 70% trigger to readdress, he doesn't think that factor is necessary. *Pridemore* said that he agrees with Commissioners Morris and *Stanton* regarding population and housing – the 2.69%. He said on infrastructure deductions, the 27.5% is the most documented and justifiable rate; however, he could see going up to 30% just to provide some distinction. He said lowering it to a more realistic and observed

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

number would be appropriate. In regards to the redevelopment factor, Pridemore said he is uncomfortable raising it, but wasn't exactly sure what the rate should be. He said perhaps they could talk about it more to find out what everyone is thinking. Pridemore said that regarding the urban/rural split, they went into it with the assumption that the 81/19 was still appropriate. He said that is something they do need to address and that for him 83/17 would be appropriate for them to make a change to. He further explained. He said agreed on the site specific request in that wherever it fits within the possibilities of the plan they should try to honor those specific requests. On the economic development piece, Pridemore said he was nervous about going to a 12/22 jobs-per-acre; however, if they do move to more of a jobs population, having the lower number would give them the additional industrial land and a buffer to provide some choice. He said they can change the density number, but he doesn't want to see them drop too many of those acres. Specifically, he said they need to look at the large parcel sizes where they can, or at least places where there are several parcels that can be aggregated. That seems to be where, regionally, they're lacking in options. Pridemore said he was open to the idea of an industrial lands bank, but the specifics of where and when it's applied needs to be flushed out. He said in terms of alternatives, he now preferred Alternative 2A, but that some adjustments would need to be made. He said it had the best balance. He said he agreed with Commissioner Stanton on the urban reserves being the preferred first alternative.

Stanton brought up the question regarding the Camas and Vancouver area boundary.

Pridemore said he would like to see a buffer between Vancouver and Camas.

Stanton said she agreed, in general, about the buffers. She said she would like to keep some kind of a visual distinction between cities, but the potential for cost-effective development in that area with the addition of 192nd, which they put a lot of effort into, is kind of like the question about where to draw the line – along a road, or on the other side of the road; and getting the best out of the infrastructure. She said as much as she would like to see green space between cities to clearly differentiate them, in realistically looking at the most cost effective kinds of growth and the potential that area has, she said that she would now prefer that they move to draw that line.

Pridemore said he would ask that they leave it open and see if staff can work out a place where a distinction could be made, if possible.

Rich Lowry, Prosecuting Attorney's Office, said they did have a remand for failure to include a green space, where the two cities now touch, which GMA does require. He said it was highly likely that this issue would get the attention of the hearings board.

Rich Carson, Department of Community Development, added that the cities should address the issue and think more about where it is.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Stanton said that you don't have to literally keep the boundaries separated, but visually some green space would need to be included.

Morris asked Commissioner Pridemore to link his preference for Alternative 2A with his preference for a 1.95% population.

Pridemore explained that the effective rate of the 1.5 with those assumptions changed, gives them an effective population growth of 1.9. The move to a 1.95 is not a very significant change.

Morris said that it would actually be fitting a larger population into a smaller expansion of the urban growth boundary.

Pridemore said that they would be recognizing within the formulas what actually occurs as opposed to what they think might occur. He said things are going to develop the way they are going to develop and removing the market factor wouldn't change any of that. It wouldn't affect the density that actually occurs. He further explained.

Morris commented that there just isn't any way you can take the same number of people and put them into a smaller space without getting the result of that density.

Pridemore said in the "planning world" it looks like the density is different, but in actuality it's not.

Morris said Pridemore was assuming that all of the issues about population growth forecast and increased number of jobs can be met on less land. In other words, they will be meeting the same targets with using less land than they did in Alternative 2. There's less land in Alternative 2A versus Alternative 2, and all of the other numbers are the same.

Pridemore said that Alternative 2A is essentially his preferred direction. It's something to launch from. He said that on the economic development piece, the jobs to population linkage was an important issue, but that as they map and make sure that they're adding more land, it shouldn't just be linked to the population forecast. He added that they've got to continue working on all of the program initiatives for producing more jobs.

Morris said she didn't see any contraction in her suggestion to move to 12 & 22 in the number of job-producing lands that they add. She said she sees the radical change not in the density per acre, but in separating it from the growth factor and linking it to the total population, and what they wind up with is a lot more land than they've seen now. She asked Jose Alvarez, Department of Community Development, how many jobs they would have to create if they

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

decide that they're going to have one job per household in the year 2023 – including total population, how many jobs would they have?

There was further discussion regarding population, jobs, etc. (tape was inaudible at times...)

Morris agreed with what they were talking about as far as what the realistic and optimistic part of it is. She said they are also tying it to the provision of land. She said if they don't tie up the land now, the land isn't going to be tied up. She said she has begun to think in terms of a minimum of 20 years and definitely not in 10 years, so if you were to take all of the land that the cities want to add for industrial and if you were to also put an industrial reserve/futures over the Discovery Corridor, they might begin to have sufficient available land.

Stanton asked for clarification as to whether Commissioner *Morris* had proposed the 12/22.

Morris said that if they are going to take fundamentally truth issues, then they should take them all the way across the board. She disagreed with Commissioner *Stanton* regarding the future of urbanizing development. She said they are more likely to see creation of new cities in the future than they would see significant annexations for existing cities because that is so difficult to achieve. She noted that the most troubled area right now that doesn't appear to have much prospect of either incorporating or annexing is the Salmon Creek/Felida/Hazel Dell area. She said they need to be realistic.

Stanton commented that one of the things she has frequently talked about is the fact that they do have so much unincorporated urban area – not a good idea because they don't have the tools in which to deal with it. She said the public has indicated that they want the county to be cost-effective and don't want to spend anymore on government services than they have to. She said when she looks at the idea of Salmon Creek/Felida/Hazel Dell separated and incorporating versus annexing to Vancouver, she sees the loss of an opportunity for the economy of scale that you get when you have a big city. She said she felt they needed to have a clear annexation policy in their comprehensive land use plan. She reiterated that with the tax structure they have, she didn't think it would be a good idea for them to continue adding urbanized areas that they can't serve.

Pridemore said that one of the flaws in the GMA is that it states that urban services will be provided by cities, but it doesn't provide any mechanism by which incorporations or annexations are required.

Morris asked what the Board's points of agreement were.

Pridemore said they were in agreement regarding population/housing at 2.69%.

There was brief discussion regarding the issue of jobs per acre.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Pridemore said that as far as jobs per acre, he said he could only support 12 & 22 if they were going to pursue a more aggressive lands policy.

Morris said she thought they needed to add, at the cities' request, what they would like to add in job-producing lands. She said her underlying value when it comes to job-producing lands is that containing the urban growth boundaries is irrelevant to her when it comes to job-producing lands. She said they either play with the numbers again or just say "how much land do we want to add?" She said they may want to talk about how they want it to unfold, but once it's gone it's gone.

There was further discussion regarding jobs per acre.

Morris stated that if she was going to err on the side of more job-producing land or less job-producing land, she wanted to err on the side of more.

Pridemore said he felt they were in agreement on this issue regarding the fact that they need to have a very solid rationale.

Morris commented that there was nothing in their record that suggested a focus on job creation over residential creation in the 1994 plan; this plan has got tomes of reference to their desire to create jobs.

Lowry said the big issue was going to be the potential for conversion.

Stanton asked *Lowry* how they get the agreements with the cities – do they formalize them?

Lowry said the logical place for it to be done would be as a countywide planning policy, which means that the county adopts it, but after consultation with the city.

Pridemore asked *Lowry* if they put an urban holding on it and the city goes forward to annex it without the county's participation, could the city then eliminate the urban holding and move forward without...

Lowry answered yes. He reiterated that if there's a countywide planning policy then their action could be challenged as being GMA non-compliant. He added that it was important to address this issue.

There was more discussion regarding the 2.69 figure.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Carson stated that his understanding was that they were in agreement on the 10 & 22 and also the one job per household at 2.69% - those would be the driving employment numbers.

There was further discussion between the Board and staff regarding possible scenarios using the computer model.

Morris moved onto the market factor issue and said that she would be receptive to a minor reduction, but said that she didn't think eliminating the market factor was a good idea. She said if they begin to eliminate the market factor, they would be constricting and forcing growth. She further explained that if they eliminate that they will leave out any opportunity for human behavior and preference to exercise itself.

Pridemore said when the GMA was first put together the market factor did make sense. When the Senate bill came in, which made it a 10-year requirement for automatic review and adjustment, it already created, or did then create, a market factor of 100%. He said under the current system, he didn't think having an additional market factor was justifiable.

Stanton said her understanding of why the market factor was added had to do with the price part, not the people who didn't want to sell. She said in looking at any expansion of the boundaries she would have to assume that you had your land absorption within the current boundaries. So, she would take the market factor out of the current boundaries, but in added land you could incorporate a market factor similar to the way it was done the first time.

Lee explained that they backed into what the total (inaudible) is, including using up the existing capacity, and then they applied the market factor to that total.

Morris reiterated that she was uncomfortable with their thinking that it was a 10-year plan. She further explained. She said if they don't do sufficient expansion at this point in time, they won't be able.

(Tape ends abruptly...sounds like it's possibly a different/later portion of the hearing...)

(Pridemore speaking...) "...bring assumptions and make some changes on that...wanted to come back and touch on that again here before we get to specific mapping issues. Any other thoughts that have been raised or...Betty Sue?"

Stanton stated that she has a lingering concern that if they immediately include all of this land inside of the urban growth boundary, are they defeating their own purposes of trying to get the most out of the infrastructure they have. She said she would like to see the market factor worth

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

or something put into a reserve of some sort. She said they need to get to the discussion of the focus public investment areas.

Pridemore said in looking at when the capital facilities plan comes together, exactly what can they afford. He asked how many focus public investment areas there currently were – 17? He said they are obviously not going to be able to focus that many public investments, so they definitely need to prioritize as they look at the mapping process. He said he was concerned about the retail acres portion just in what they are talking about expanding, and whether they'll have retail to service those areas that they are expanding toward. He said they still have areas in the county that aren't adequately served close to the residential for commercial, etc., so they need to bear that in mind as they finalize things. *Pridemore* said the only issue he had was how they phrase the market factor because he feels it is confusing for people and changing it to "incentive market factor" or "incentive factor" would be more transparent for citizens.

Stanton agreed that she wanted it to be transparent, but that it truly was meant to be a market factor to provide for options.

Morris said she didn't see any reason for not calling it a market factor.

Stanton said that what they do with it is what matters and that's part of the discussion they need to have – how do they add that much land? Do they just do it and not worry about competition and where the infrastructure has already been invested in?

Morris said she felt they needed to pay attention to what the private sector has told them, which is that one of the really important things is parcel size. She said when they link this discussion to focus public investment they need to talk about whose money is being invested. If they're talking about investing their money in it, she wants to know what money they invest inside a city limit that they might otherwise have available to invest outside. She said when she thinks about focus public investment, she sees those choices that are inside of city limits as the city's choice because we can't direct them.

Lowry said they clearly cannot direct them, but on the other hand they could make a determination as to the appropriate amount of industrial land within a city. He further explained.

Pridemore asked if there was anything else in terms of assumptions that they wanted to address or did they have the working figures.

Morris again referenced the market factor and asked staff for clarification regarding the numbers for net acres and what the addition to net acres was (residential), as well as clarification regarding whether the numbers were net or gross.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Staff explained that the handout reflected gross numbers.

Pridemore said what they were looking at in the existing alternatives were probably close to Alternative 4 at this point with these assumptions than they were with Alternative 2.

Morris agreed.

Pridemore moved onto the mapping issues...

(Tape abruptly cuts off again.)

Morris said the question is – “what would be the additional areas required if you only applied the market factor for the population that cannot be accommodated inside the current urban growth boundaries?” She said she did not think that would need to be reoffered again for the population that is being accommodated inside urban growth boundaries.

Lowry said he wasn’t sure it made any sense to only apply it outside because what’s happening is that they are essentially starting the same analysis that they did in 1994, which applied a 25% market factor to both the vacant buildable land that was already within cities, and the area that was within the old urban service line and the area beyond that. He further explained. *Lowry* said that Pat Lee was not adding the 25% onto the old 25%; he’s looking at the vacant buildable land within the current boundaries today and it all works out.

Lee explained that (*Lowry*) was doing it based on what the total available capacity is and additional capacity that is brought in by expansion of urban growth boundaries – that is how they calculate it.

Lowry said if you did it only on the additional land, what you would be saying then is that you have zero market factor worth the stuff that’s in the current boundary because you’re getting rid of the old market factor within that area.

Morris said that capacity usage shows that under Alternative 2, which is a reasonable place for them to work from, this is in fact the plan to use up almost to the market factor. She asked what percentage of land is left inside urban growth boundaries of both vacant buildable and underutilized land.

Alvarez replied that based on these assumptions, 85,000.

Lee said a population of 85,000 can be accommodated on the land within existing urban growth boundaries.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Morris said she was trying to compare the land consumption from 1994 and the present, and of the land consumption inside urban growth boundaries how much of it remains counted in their inventory.

Lee said they broke it out by residential, commercial, and industrial and he didn't know where the residential was. He said he thought industrial was between 11%-16%; commercial was maybe 30%-35% land absorption; and residential was higher.

The Board adjourned for a short break.

Pridemore reconvened the meeting.

Morris suggested they look at Mr. Alvarez's model, pick up where they left off and change one item at a time.

Pridemore said that starting from the very top they have Annual Growth Rate as the first item. He said in their earlier discussions there were recommendations for changes moving it upward from 1.83 to 1.95. He asked for clarification from staff and said his understanding was that the revised OFM population, 1.95, was the middle.

Staff said that was the average annual rate.

Brian Snodgrass, Department of Community Development, commented.

Pridemore said for the purposes of the demonstration, he was comfortable with the 1.83 figure.

Alvarez used the 1.83 figure. There was clarification by staff about the tools they were using. *Lee* said in order to get to Net Residential Acres Needed, you would need to bring in roughly twice as many raw acres.

The Commissioners briefly discussed each item and decided on the following numbers:

- Urban Split: 90
- Persons per Household: 2.69
- Redevelopment Factor: 5
- Critical Lands Factor: 10
- Infrastructure: 27.5

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

- Market Factor: 0

Discussion continued and the computer model was used to create different scenarios for each item.

Pridemore suggested going back to the top and working their way down again. He asked if they were looking at the range...and then see how it looks in terms of mapping. He went over the numbers again as follows: 1.83%; 90/10; 2.69; 5%; 10%; 30% for infrastructure...

Morris requested that they talk about infrastructure and stated that it didn't include schools.

Lee explained that the way they looked at infrastructure reduction is they took built out areas and calculated how much there was for schools. He said you look at a built out area and figure out how much acreage of that land was dedicated to schools, which converts into a percentage and fits within the 27.5%.

Pridemore commented that they need to be represented somewhere in the formulas. He then referenced the Market Factor issue and keeping it at 0%; however, he suggested that they needed to change the name of it so that it would be more easily understood when they get down to the employment lands, that it's an incentive to support their economic development strategy.

Morris stated that she can't support there not being a market factor because she didn't feel that was realistic.

Stanton said that she thought Market Factor was a defensible term when talking about the job piece of it. She said that term made sense to her because it is one case in which they have to have a lot of choice available.

Pridemore explained that he was thinking in terms of jargon when dealing with citizens.

Morris stated that they need to talk about the policy of siting schools outside of urban growth boundaries for those schools that are huge. In addition, she asked if they could talk some more about the underutilized land criteria. She said she thought it was unlikely that in the next 20 years a one-acre lot with \$375,000 worth of house on it would redevelop. She asked if anyone else felt that way.

Pridemore said there was an estimate in the formulas which states that some will and some won't.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Morris asked for explanation regarding the 5% redevelopment and how it ties to the percentage of underutilized vacant buildable lands they have calculated. She said it would have been helpful in doing the vacant lands inventory to have a summary. She further explained.

Oliver Orjiako, Department of Community Development, responded.

Morris asked what they have seen in the past.

Orjiako stated that it hasn't been monitored.

Morris asked if they look back for one year.

Lee said that Bob Higbie had frozen 2001, but they have 2002 and should be able to do a GIS comparison for that one-year period.

Pridemore said that would be worth looking at. *Pridemore* moved onto the issue of retail.

Morris asked if staff could take a look at the North Park development.

Lowry said the way he understood (inaudible) residential is to take a bigger area than just one development.

Pridemore moved onto Business Park...

Carson said that business park under the Market Factor is more aligned to retail than industrial. He asked if they wanted it aligned with retail versus industrial. (Industrial: 50%; Retail: 25%.)

Pridemore said on the Business Park allocation they are also including self-storage companies...would probably fall within this kind of a category...ones that have very low employment density.

Pridemore adjourned the meeting for a short break.

(Nothing further is recorded on Side B of Tape 23)

Pridemore said he wanted to double check where 90/10 would take them in terms of capacity. He asked if they would need to add any lots.

Carson said no.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Pridemore said there was an issue of La Center trying to get urban growth boundary out to the junction, which hasn't worked. He asked if there was a certain way they should proceed with the UGB's.

Morris said they have essentially come up with numbers that pretty well fit the cities' proposals, with the exceptions of the jobs.

Carson asked if the industrial land bank jobs are part of the job total acreage here or are they outside of that number.

Pridemore said he thought they had to be outside of that number. He said whether they call it an urban reserve or an overlay, it needs to be reflected in the EIS work in the event (specifically, looking at the La Center Junction) that something comes forward...

Carson said that's logical because it's a completely different product type that they're looking at.

Pridemore asked if there were any objections to the La Center requests to add a residential, a commercial, and a reserve.

Morris said no.

Pridemore asked if anyone had a problem with staff leaving that on the table as they sort through specific mapping.

Stanton said if they're just within the city. She said the junction piece they are talking about is the industrial land bank and it doesn't really take in the whole junction.

Staff further clarified La Center's request(s).

Pridemore said he didn't have a problem with the La Center residential or commercial reserve coming across the Lewis River, although he didn't know how they would make that work. He asked if they wanted to take any of that off the table.

Morris said she thought there was a significant change on the south side of the River. She said she wasn't very excited about any of the late proposals; that they've been doing this for a very long time. She said she didn't mind their small addition of residential or commercial, but probably not on the other side.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Pridemore and *Stanton* agreed. *Pridemore* asked that staff keep all of that in mind as they move forward. He said the La Center junction area and doing something in terms of including in the EIS, but not creating an urban growth boundary.

Stanton said – “no, the industrial land bank opportunity...”

Morris said there are two different areas – the industrial bank is a little to the south of that, or are they included in the industrial land bank?

Staff said it’s included, but the pattern on the map is larger than that specific proposal that was put forward.

Pridemore said that is a part of Alternative 2A that he likes. He said it is a larger area for analysis and inclusion in this. He said the idea of adding the Cowlitz property up there in the EIS, even though they don’t have a real control over it, seems to be an appropriate thing to do. It is a larger area, but it would have them more prepared.

Morris said it would, but she’d hate to sacrifice the industrial land bank for that.

Carson said he didn’t think the Cowlitz would be in the industrial land bank.

Morris asked if they have made a decision on the industrial land bank to go ahead and do EIS work.

Pridemore and *Stanton* replied yes.

Morris asked if they are also making a decision to consider urban holding at that intersection.

Pridemore said he didn’t think it would go under urban holding.

Staff replied that the industrial land bank was outside of urban growth boundary, so it would not be urban holding. It would be urban reserve.

Morris said they have already taken care of the industrial land bank. She asked if it was proposed that they also discuss EIS work on a new area to be called urban holding, which is not the industrial land bank.

Stanton added that it’s at the junction, where Commissioner *Pridemore* was talking about including the tribal lands – what kind of category would that fall under?

Carson said they could call it urban reserve.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Lowry said one of the comp plan policies that the Board could make in terms of industrial land banks is that they need to be located within an industrial reserve area.

Pridemore said that he's suggesting that they should plan for that area as if it were urban reserve just so they are prepared for whatever does occur. *Pridemore* moved on to the City of Ridgefield, stating that they have essentially two requests – a significant expanse to the east of I-5, and one in the south for the school property.

Morris said she wasn't very receptive to the new suggestion to add that area.

Pridemore agreed and said he felt they already have a lot of potential within their existing area, and adding more seems to be excessive.

Stanton said she would like for staff to take a look at the high school site.

Pridemore asked – “what's the little corner piece up there?”

Staff replied that it was a 30-acre potential church/school and commercial area.

There was further discussion.

Stanton stated that she didn't want to get too detailed in the discussion before staff takes a look at it, but that she wasn't inclined to want to do it.

Pridemore said if they're not inclined to do it, then they should let staff know before they go ahead and make assumptions.

Morris suggested that they find out whether the church owns the land.

Staff read a portion of the letter (from Ridgefield to the Steering Committee) – “...the addition of approximately 30 acres southwest of the intersection of SR-501 and 45th Avenue for a church, church/school, and a master plan business park use.” He said the designation they are suggesting is commercial.

Morris asked if it was currently designated AG.

Staff said yes.

Pridemore referenced Alternative 2 (map) and the west edge of the empty space. He asked if that was based on the city's request or if we put it there as a placeholder.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Staff replied that they needed to add it to get the acres, the city wasn't requesting it.

Stanton asked if Ridgefield had urban reserve other than what they've already annexed.

Carson said he didn't believe they did.

Lee said there was urban reserve in the surrounding areas of the junction that aren't in the city limits.

Staff referenced the map.

Pridemore said they've talked about the urban reserves being given extra consideration because they're representation's made so he would not rule that out just on that basis.

Morris referred to one woman who owned property to the south of Ridgefield who was surrounded by urban growth and she was in Agri-Forest, and the recommendation was to leave her in AG because it was large parcel. *Morris* asked Bob Higbie where that land was now.

Higbie said he would check into the situation.

Pridemore moved onto Washougal and asked Oliver Orjiako what their request was exactly.

Orjiako responded.

Carson said that at one point Washougal was interested in a potential school site.

Pridemore said the map looked like it was colored for urban reserve; he said he wouldn't object to putting it in reserve.

There was brief discussion regarding the request from the City of Camas...school site.

Carson asked Orjiako how much land was associated with the school.

Orjiako estimated 40 acres.

Morris asked what they wanted it to be added as.

Carson said urban low density.

Stanton said she thought the proposal was to make it denser before it develops into Rural 5.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

The Commissioners agreed that there was no problem with that.

Pridemore moved onto the Camas Meadows area.

Stanton commented that she has a number of principals by which she weighs each request, one of them being proximity to resource land. She said they have already taken the piece of agricultural land that's on the 162nd side and surrounded it with low density residential – that would just wrap it around the rest of the way. She said she didn't have much interest in that one.

Morris said she didn't have a lot of concern regarding the city's request. She asked for clarification about whether they want to move to low density residential for the purple area.

Carson said they wanted to move it to mixed use.

Stanton said she would still pursue it under the destination resort idea, which was the original proposal.

Carson said that hasn't changed much, but that they could certainly maximize profit on the whole project if they add residential to a golf course.

Pridemore said he didn't like the idea of having houses along the hillside. He suggested they look at how the mapping works out, but would place the Camas Meadows at a lower priority. *Pridemore* moved onto the Vancouver/Camas agreement. He said there was a general approval of the concept that the two cities have come to.

Morris said she was fine with it, although she thought it was curious.

Stanton said she didn't have any problems with it, except a bit of a concern looking at the north end of that piece. She said the residential that is left up there should be considered for inclusion to make it a realistic area to serve.

There was brief discussion about the question of leaving that piece out.

Pridemore said in regards to Battle Ground/Vancouver he has indicated that staying comfortably south of North Fork and East Fork, and comfortably north of Salmon Creek – those would be beginning grounds in terms of their request.

Morris asked what the school district would be if it was moved to Section 30 – would it move into the Evergreen School District?

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Pridemore said yes.

Morris said she didn't have a concern about keeping the development away from Salmon Creek so much as a concern about the sanctity of Meadow Glade. She said she would like to see some sort of interlocal or a part of the planning policies...that they don't re-do any of the zoning in Meadow Glade.

Pridemore said there are some large areas in Meadow Glade that could develop at higher urban levels of density.

Stanton asked if Alternative 2A would take in Meadow Glade, but still stay north of Salmon Creek and north of Brush Prairie.

Pridemore referenced the map and the piece he was talking about.

Stanton asked staff to check into whether it was currently part of Meadow Glade's rural center.

Staff stated that the issue was whether or not they should take in the entire boundary.

Carson said they would take a look at it.

Morris agreed and asked what they were actually doing with the amount of land that the City of Battle Ground had asked for. She said Battle Ground has essentially asked for a significant amount of population. She said she would really like staff to look at that. She said she wasn't concerned about it moving to the south to Salmon Creek. She commented that she doesn't understand why Battle Ground didn't go to the west, which seems like a very logical direction. She further explained. She said they have chosen to go to the north and to the south; to the south, Salmon Creek isn't an issue. To the north, however, the East Fork is an issue.

Pridemore said it seemed that the land to the south in the Meadow Glade area was not as wet as the area going to the west. He shared Commissioner Morris' concern about the residential development and said he thought they did that as a bid to get more industrial jobs land, but if the jobs don't develop and the residential does, he said he worried about the Battle Ground School District's and city's ability to fund necessary improvements.

Stanton said that was a good opportunity for the holding zone to be applied with the school's piece, that it be counted as part of the infrastructure that needs to be planned for and funded before it gets annexed.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Lowry said right now most of the UGA's, other than Vancouver, have holding, but the condition is that you can't develop them until they are annexed. He said they can't simply say in their policy that if it's annexed it has to stay in holding until something happens. The city has to do that in their plan.

Stanton said the school districts had asked that they specifically keep in mind that part of the infrastructure that needs to be available when an area is annexed, or taken out of holding, is schools. She asked how they can make that happen.

Lowry said it should be a part of a countywide policy that's bought on by the cities and reflected in their own comp plans.

Stanton said she would like to pursue that.

Morris asked if someone could find out the difference in capacity between moving it to low density residential and what it is right now. She asked what the actual capacity is in terms of households or people. She said right now it is R-5.

Orjiako asked if she was referring to the Meadow Glade area.

Morris said there are three parts to the discussion regarding all of the additional area that Battle Ground has suggested: 1) pulling back from Salmon Creek; 2) including Meadow Glade; and 3) additional children from that area into the school district. *Morris* said in terms of additional children in the school district, there are going to be children into the school district now under the plan because it's residential. She further explained.

Pridemore moved to the issue of Vancouver/North Park/Fairgrounds area. In terms of the eastside of I-5 going up to 219th and including that, *Pridemore* said that was premature until they get an infrastructure policy in place and develop the Discovery Corridor concept.

Morris said that was the part of Alternative 2A that she liked the best because they had to have some place to put the new acres of job-producing land.

Pridemore said the area extending to the west, north of 179th Street, seemed to be prime as far as potential for development.

Carson asked Commissioner *Pridemore* if he was talking about going from 2A to 4.

Pridemore said Alternative 4 would be his preference in the Fairgrounds (area).

Stanton asked if Alternative 4 was currently in urban reserve.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Orjiako responded.

Morris asked where they were going to put all of the acres. Where are they going to put the 4,000 acres, the industrial acres and the business park acres, which equals 8,000 gross?

Pridemore explained that what he saying is that by looking at the 179th area, rather than saying that it's all residential development, that should be an area they look at. It's consistent with the Discovery Corridor concept, but rather doing it in stages.

Stanton clarified.

Morris asked how many acres.

Staff replied that it was 1,200 acres.

Morris said she was becoming uncomfortable with the level of detail and giving direction to staff. She further explained. She said that at this point in time she would ask staff to go back and take a look at all of the different suggestions...to look at the issue of a variety of parcel sizes, etc.

Pridemore said his concern was that if they turn it over to staff without sufficient direction about what they are willing to entertain, they would just be making them do iteration after iteration, and they would end up completing things in 2004.

Morris said on focus public investment, they need to do a significant expansion around Battle Ground. She said they don't want to take Alternative 2A until they know what it does to parcel size. She said she felt they were getting far too specific.

Pridemore said if they aren't specific now they would be sending staff away without very clear direction about how to actually start mapping based on the assumptions they've agreed to.

Morris said she started at Alternative 2 versus 2A and perhaps that has caused some of difficulties. She said she didn't take significant looks at the maps because she didn't realize they would be getting to the level of detail they did.

Stanton said she looked at the maps in relationship to the school districts and the proposed industrial lands, jobs land. She said she looked at general points of interest such as the land between Camas and Vancouver; she would rather not add any of the prime AG parcels that are currently in the open space REET proposal; she wants to minimize urban residential against the AG zoned land; move into the urban reserves that have already been designated. She said she

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

had some interest in the land between Lacamas Park and the new high school and an interest in including the school sites where practical. Stanton then referenced Windsong Acres and the issue of development in Brush Prairie. She said she was interested in learning some more about what was being proposed. Stanton then stated that she had a question that Rudy Podhora brought up regarding an overlay on the map for his wildlife sanctuary. She also referenced the Presbyterian Church comment they received, at the corner of 162nd and 20th Street. (She went over her list...)

Pridemore referenced the Discovery Corridor.

Stanton said for a long term plan for Clark County she agrees with the Discovery Corridor. She said she wants to move into urban reserves first.

Lee stated that it would be helpful to give staff some geographic-specific instruction would be very helpful. He said it wouldn't need to be precise parcel boundaries, but if they're going to emphasize Ridgefield junction, 179th, or Fishers Swale, etc., that would be important in terms of how they put the puzzle together.

Carson asked if there was anything that the Board was already in agreement about...

Pridemore said they have clearly agreed on Fishers Swale that essentially the city agreement is what they want to operate from. He said the agreed on issues regarding the school districts. He said there was some uncertainty about how to handle the Battle Ground circumstance. As far as the La Center junction and doing something there, they agreed about that. He said they were in agreement regarding Ridgefield and not doing the proposal.

Carson asked if there was anything else that the Board didn't want.

Morris said she wanted some clue about where they were going to put 8,086 acres of job-producing land.

Pridemore said a lot of that would be eaten up between Fishers Swale, Battle Ground, and 179th Street. He said the issue for him was Meadow Glade.

Morris asked how big Fishers Swale is.

Staff responded that it's approximately 1,000/1,200 altogether.

Morris asked for further clarification on the numbers.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Higbie said that the City of Vancouver's last proposal did ask for a significant amount of industrial land northeast of the city. He said he didn't know how much.

There was further discussion.

Lee said they would figure out the total.

Morris asked about Discovery Corridor on the long range.

Lee responded that it seemed more in terms of a potential reserve area as opposed to bringing it into the boundary now, and engage in some sort of process to try and flush out what it should become.

Lowry said they have three choices: 1) bring it in zoned; 2) put it in reserve; or 3) bring it in holding. He said holding (inside) could even suggest that this is not likely to develop within 10 years.

Staff (Laurie) suggested the Board could revisit the market factor for industrial and commercial lands if they don't feel comfortable with expanding it as much as it looks like it's going.

Pridemore said he felt that rather than putting it in urban reserve, it would be more appropriate to put it into urban holding.

There was discussion about scheduling a follow-up hearing.

Pridemore asked staff if they had sufficient information to begin moving forward with EIS and the capital facilities portions.

Lee said that the map in large part would drive some of that.

Hearing Reconvened at 2 p.m. for a Bid Opening

Louise Richards, Clerk of the Board; Mike Westerman and Allyson Anderson, General Services; and members of the public were present at the bid openings.

BID OPENING CRP 382312

Held a public hearing for Bid Opening CRP 382312 – LaLonde Creek Drainage Facilities – Vicinity of NE 119 Street. Mike Westerman, General Services, opened and read bids.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 1, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Westerman said it was their intention to award Bid CRP 382312 on July 8, 2003, at 10:00 a.m., in the Commissioners' hearing room of the Clark County Public Service Center, 6th Floor.
(See Tape 24)

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Craig A. Pridemore/s/
Craig A. Pridemore, Chair

Betty Sue Morris/s/
Betty Sue Morris, Commissioner

Judie Stanton, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Louise Richards/s/
Clerk of the Board

rt